

Professional Standards Advisory Board Minutes

January 7, 2010 10 AM

The January 7, 2010 meeting of the Professional Standards Advisory Board was called to order by Ms. Carrie Billman at 10:05 a.m. Ms. Billman conducted the meeting in the absence of board secretary Jason Woebkenberg who, along with members Daghe and Goodwin, was not able to attend due to poor weather conditions. Ms. Billman led attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance and began the meeting with a brief explanation that she intended to generally follow Roberts Rules of Order to manage the board's discussion and business. Ms. Billman recognized Dr. Bennett for opening remarks.

Dr. Bennett began by acknowledging that the board has been working on rule changes that impact teacher preparation, but he urged everyone not to forget that it takes passion to be an educator and to "do it right." He introduced Teresa Meredith, Vice President of ISTA, and thanked her for bringing J.D. Miller to the attention of the DOE. He explained that J.D. graduated from Indiana State University's teacher education program and with Pat Mapes' assistance, he received his teaching license from the department before losing his struggle with cancer. J.D. passionately wanted to become a teacher. He passed away the day after Christmas. J.D. spoke to department employees at an October staff meeting about his love for education. Dr. Bennett observed that everyone entering the classroom to change students' lives should have great passion and intense desire to be an educator.

Ms. Billman presented the minutes of the November 18 and December 10, 2009 meetings for approval. Dr. Johnstone moved for approval with a second by Mr. Zoeller. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Billman turned the floor over to Mr. Tusing, analyst with the Office of Legal Affairs, to go over the drafting of changes to REPA voted on by the board at the two previous meetings. Mr. Tusing explained that he created a three-panel document that allowed the board to look at the proposed rule as published, amendments recommended by the board's work groups and approved at prior meetings, and the changes as drafted to accomplish the amendments and technical changes identified by DOE staff. Mr. Tusing explained he would go through each article of the proposed rules to discuss changes and answer questions about the drafting. The proposed rule document was projected on a screen and any changes made by consent of the board would be made in real time during the meeting. Additionally, he explained that after the board votes to adopt the proposed rule it must be transmitted first to the Office of the Attorney General for review and approval, and then to the Governor's Office for signature before it becomes effective. Mr. Tusing began his discussion by noting a necessary deletion in the digest of the proposed rule that Dr. Cate-Clements pointed out concerning a reading comprehension test that was previously removed from the document.

Starting with Article 1 and the section containing definitions (515 IAC 1-1-96), Dr. Johnston asked for clarification on the definition of "out of state applicants" and wondered if it was intentional that it includes applicants from any state, not just from Interstate Compact Agreement member states. Mr. Tusing indicated it was intentionally broader. Dr. Johnstone suggested a tweak in the definition of "teacher training institution" that was accepted by the consent of the board.

Dr. Cate-Clements asked for clarification on the definition of "applicant," specifically whether an applicant is applying for a "right" or a "privilege" to hold an Indiana license. Discussion followed with the board consenting to change "privilege" to "a license or permit."

Dr. Van Horn asked for clarification on subject matter concentration relative to the definition of "general education and subject matter concentration." Mr. Tusing then noted that the definition of "National Reading Panel" would be deleted since references to that organization were previously removed from the proposed rules.

Dr. Van Horn questioned the removal of non-accredited nonpublic schools in 515 IAC 1-5-1. Mr. Tusing explained that the reference to those schools was deleted since the board and the DOE have no authority over them. That deletion was recommended by the Article 1 working group and was approved by the board at a prior meeting.

Dr. Johnstone commented that in 515 IAC 1-6-3(b), between “developmental” and “content,” the word should be “and” not “or.” Discussion ensued and the board agreed to the change by consent.

Dr. Cate-Clements asked for and received clarification that there is no residency required for district level administrators. Dr. Johnstone asked for clarification as to the role of the higher education licensing advisor in recommending additions to licenses at the same time as license renewal. She and Dr. Van Horn inquired as to who verifies the completion of the addition coursework and how that is accomplished under the new rule language. The OELD staff indicated that there will continue to be a process whereby licensing advisors verify and recommend additions. Dr. Van Horn addressed the option for teachers to complete 6 semester hours renewal coursework in any subject and asked who will verify that the coursework is appropriate for renewal. Since coursework is an option under professional growth plans, the building level administrator will verify points for the coursework. For superintendents, it would be the school board president who verifies professional growth plan points.

Dr. Cate-Clements asked what IC 20-28-4 refers to in 515 IAC 1-6-1(b) regarding transition to teaching. Mr. Tusing explained that reference is the Indiana Code cite for Transition to Teaching programs. The intent is not to create a conflict by requiring a transition to teaching program for an approved program in rule that is exempt from transition to teaching by statute. An example is Masters in Teaching programs, which are approved programs but which are exempt under the statute because they are already a type of transition to teaching program. Dr. Van Horn pointed out that in 515 IAC 1-7-14.1(c), “professional growth experiences” should say “professional growth points.” The board consented to the change. When asked if language should be added to that subsection stating that the decision of the department is final, Mr. Tusing’s opinion was that it wasn’t necessary.

Dr. Van Horn returned to 515 IAC 1-7-14, asking if it is advisable to require the holder of a 10-year license to complete renewal work only within the second five year period. That might discourage license holders from completing professional development throughout the 10 year validity period. Mr. Tusing noted that that requirement is also found in Article 12 regarding Accomplished Practitioner licenses and suggested the matter be dealt with when Article 12 is discussed.

The board began its discussion on Article 3. Dr. Cate-Clements asked for clarification on what type of basic proficiency test will be required as part of program approval for teacher education programs. Mr. Tusing and Dr. Johnstone commented that teacher education programs can begin requiring demonstration of basic proficiency in ways other than Praxis I, such as SAT, ACT, or GRE scores approved by the board after a certain date.

Dr. Van Horn asked about the term “curriculum requirements” in 515 IAC 3-1-1(c) (2) and (c) (3) and indicated his belief it should say “content requirements” in both subsections. The board consented to the changes. Dr. Cate-Clements had a question about 515 IAC 3-1-1(c) and whether in the first sentence it should say “and” rather than “or.” Mr. Tusing, Dr. Mast, OELD staff, and Dr. Johnstone explained that a program might be submitted in a content area (for addition to an existing license only) that would not need to include developmental standards. Applicants for initial licenses would still need to show they have met both developmental and content standards. After much discussion Dr. Van Horn moved to change “or” to “and.” The motion was seconded. The motion failed on a vote of 8-7 due to lack of majority of the board voting aye.

Next Dr. Cate-Clements addressed the requirement of approved programs to submit a report annually to the department under 515 IAC 3-1-1(f) (2). In order to avoid confusion with the institutional report required by NCATE it was suggested that “the institutional report” be change to “an annual report.” Following discussion the board consented to change (f) (2) to say that approved programs will provide an annual report to the board in a format determined by the board.

The board moved on to Article 4. Dr. Johnstone asked to address 515 IAC 4-2-1(d) regarding the addition of content areas to existing licenses. Mr. Tusing explained that parallel language exists in 3 places in the rule and recommended that it only be included once in Article 8. Consequently, Mr. Tusing recommended deleting (d). Dr. Van Horn moved and Mr. Holt seconded the deletion of 4-2-1(d). The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Johnson noted that since (d) was deleted, the reference to (d) in 4-2-1(c) (3) should instead reference to appropriate section in Article 8. The board consented to the change.

In Article 5 Dr. Cate-Clements moved to remove the 119-day limitation on substitute teaching during a school year found in 515 IAC 5-1-1(c). Mr. Holt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The board moved to Article 8. Mr. Tusing recommended removing the duplicative language of 8-1-1.1(c) concerning the addition of content areas to existing licenses since it will be included in 515 IAC 8-2. The board consented to the deletion.

Dr. Van Horn asked for an explanation of the two tracks for obtaining an elementary license specified in 8-1-1.4 (1) and (2). Mr. Tusing attempted to clarify but it became apparent that the language of 8-1-1.4(2) (A) was confusing. Following discussion it was decided to change the language of 8-1-1.4(2) (A) to "A non-education baccalaureate degree." The board consented to that change and a parallel change in other sections of the rule where it is found.

Dr. Cate-Clements asked for clarification as to why there are content area section references missing in 8-1-1.5(a) (2). Mr. Tusing explained they referenced content areas that are obsolete and are not being carried over into the REPA. Dr. Van Horn asked why the reference to completion of an approved online program was removed as an option under 8-1-1.4(3). Mr. Tusing explained that when the language of Article 3 was restructured, online programs were included in the approved program requirements; there is no longer a reason to differentiate between approved "brick and mortar" programs and approved online programs.

Dr. Cate-Clements asked why the grade coverage of 515 IAC 8-1-1.7 is P-12 rather than K-12. Mr. Tusing explained that during discussion in prior meetings the board indicated it wanted all content areas to be available at all grade level settings. It did not seem consistent with the board's intent to require, for instance, that an administrator with all schools coverage not be able to supervise a pre-school program. That narrow validity was not consistent with other actions of the board to increase flexibility and it was not consistent with board discussion to create a P-12 license for one or two areas and not others. Dr. Van Horn asked how a new P-12 curriculum section could be added when it didn't exist in the proposed rule. Mr. Tusing explained that the requirements for a P-12 license existed by reference to combined elementary and secondary curriculum requirements. In adding additional grade combinations for licenses it was more logical to specify the required curriculum for each type of license.

Dr. Van Horn noted that in 515 IAC 8-1-44(a) (2), the phrase "one of the following" should be inserted before the list of options in (A) through (D). The board consented to the change.

The board entered into discussion concerning 515 IAC 8-1-50, temporary administrator license. Dr. Van Horn clarified that prior changes to this section restricted the temporary administrator license only to superintendents, so he asked to change the title of the section to temporary superintendent license. The board consented to the change. Ms. Riehl asked that this be denoted as a temporary superintendent permit instead of license. Dr. Bennett and others commented that there are statutory provisions that require a "licensed superintendent" in a school corporation. Discussion continued with clarification asked for and given that this license is not portable from corporation to corporation and that the holder of this temporary license cannot hold other administrative positions in the same district concurrent with the superintendency.

Dr. Van Horn asked if the effective date of the new pedagogy test requirement in 515 IAC 8-2-1(b) (2) should be changed from July 1, 2011 to “after August 31, 2013” in order to meet the board’s intent that teacher education students already enrolled in a program will have the opportunity to finish their program prior to new requirements going into effect. Discussion followed with the board consenting to the change. Additional discussion concerned how the OELD will know that candidates have passed basic proficiency exams prior to entry into teacher education programs and it was concluded that this is a program approval and monitoring issue.

Dr. Cate-Clements noted that in 515 IAC 8-2-1(a) (2), the reference to subsection (f) should be changed to (e). The board consented to the change.

Dr. Johnstone initiated discussion about 8-2-1(e) and whether license holders must complete content coursework AND testing to add new content areas to existing licenses. The board voted to approve “or” at one meeting in one location in the document and voted to approve “and” at another meeting in a different location in the rule. Dr. Bennett expressed his opinion that there was confusion among board members as to that change, and he admitted he had contributed to that confusion. Mr. Fronius expressed his support for the “or” option and explained how it would impact his licensure. Dr. Bennett moved and Mr. Holt seconded, that the option of completing testing “or” course content requirements be retained in the final rule with a few exceptions noted for content areas that should not be added without content coursework and testing. Dr. Cate-Clements asked to revisit the list of exceptions. Dr. Bennett recited the exceptions of communication disorders, exceptional needs, fine arts, elementary education, and early childhood. Dr. Cate-Clements asked to add high ability and ENL, and Dr. Bennett agreed to add those two areas as a friendly amendment to his motion. Discussion continued until Mr. Holt called the question. Dr. Bennett repeated his motion for the board. Ms. Billman called for a vote. The motion passed 11-5. Dr. Cate-Clements and other board members commented that it is important for the board to adopt tests for every content area in the future.

Discussion on 515 IAC 9-1-5 commenced with Dr. Cate-Clements asking how the OELD will document that in-state applicants have met all licensing requirements. Mr. McEwen stated, and OELD staff agreed, that internal processes are in place by which those requirements are documented now as part of the license processing responsibility of the department. Licensing advisors play a large role in verifying that information for the OELD and will continue to do so. Dr. Johnstone explained to the board how she verifies program completion for students applying for Indiana licenses and for licenses in 48 other states. Mr. Tusing suggested the word “law” be changed to “the department” in 9-1-5(4). Dr. Van Horn strongly disagreed. Following discussion, no change was made.

Dr. Van Horn moved to a discussion of emergency permits in 515 IAC 9-1-19, asking for an explanation of (d). Clarification was given that subsection (d) allows a teacher with an expired IN license who has not been actively employed to receive a non-renewable emergency permit for the purpose of having time to complete renewal requirements. A suggestion was made to modify the wording of the subsection to make this intent clearer. The board consented to the clarification.

Moving to Article 10, Dr. Van Horn asked about the inclusion of specific professional development activities and points for renewal of workplace specialist licenses, noting that he thought the board had removed this language previously. Dr. Bennett explained that for other license types the specificity for professional development activities had been removed to allow maximum flexibility, but the vocational educators requested that the list and point values be retained in regards to renewals for workplace specialist license renewal. Dr. Cate-Clements asked why in 10-1-4(a) (2) the phrase “vocational program subject areas” replaced “workplace specialist subject areas.” Mr. Tusing explained that the phrase mirrors the language of the State Board of Education rule that is applicable to vocational programs.

Dr. Van Horn moved into a discussion of the requirement in 515 IAC 12-1-1(c) that says only professional development completed during the second 5 year period of the 10-year license counts for renewal. Discussion ensued concerning the

pros and cons of whether professional educators should have the flexibility to determine the timing of their professional development. The board agreed to delete 12-1-1(c).

Mr. Holt moved to adopt all of the REPA as approved and modified by the board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bennett. Dr. Van Horn commented that the board was told from the beginning of the promulgation process that it could tweak the proposed rule and make technical changes but major changes must be a logical outgrowth of public comment and testimony. He asked Mr. Tusing if, in his opinion, the board had followed that guideline. Mr. Tusing responded by briefly revisiting the review/approval process by the Office of the Attorney General and he assured the board we will be working closely with the AG during the review.

Ms. Billman called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Billman moved to new business and asked Dr. Marg Mast to present her accreditation recommendation for Anderson University. At the board's request, Dr. Mast explained the term "at risk" and the difference between the state accreditation process and NCATE accreditation. The OELD recommendation is that state accreditation for Anderson University continues at the initial preparation level and that the advanced preparation level be given *at risk* status. Following discussion there was a motion and second to adopt the staff's accreditation recommendation for Anderson University. Dr. Johnstone asked if anyone from Anderson University was in attendance. There was not. Dr. Mast explained that she had invited representatives from all four institutions but because of the bad weather none attended. She indicated that none had asked for a delay in the board's consideration and none had sent a written rebuttal to the recommendations. Dr. Johnstone called the question. The motion passed 16-0.

Dr. Mast presented the OELD recommendation that state accreditation be continued at the initial preparation level for St. Mary's of the Woods College. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the staff's accreditation recommendation for St. Mary's of the Woods College. The motion passed 16-0.

Dr. Mast presented the OELD recommendation that state accreditation be continued at the initial and advanced preparation levels for University of Southern Indiana. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the OELD recommendation. The motion passed 16-0.

Dr. Mast presented the OELD recommendation that state accreditation for Purdue University Calumet is continued at the initial and advanced preparation levels. A motion was made and seconded. The motion passed 16-0.

Ms. Billman asked if any members had closing comments. Dr. Johnstone reminded the board that accreditation of teacher preparation institutions is very important and should not be taken lightly. She was sorry that representatives from the four institutions on the agenda were not present to respond to questions and hear the board's comments. Ms. Julian complimented the OELD staff and Legal staff for how well the proposed rule and all the documentation was organized and presented on such a short timeline. Mr. Mapes noted that the next major projects for the board are testing and standards, including a decision of what process the board wants to follow to accomplish each.

Dr. Bennett moved to adjourn. Following a second the board unanimously agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:27 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 11th, 2010 at 10am in the Riley Room of the Indiana Department of Education.